

Financial Secretary to Government.—

Government are not aware.

Mr. Bandaiya.—

What are the details of the income of the temple under each of the heads given in the fourth part of the answer?

Second Member of Council.—

That requires notice.

Mr. Subbanna.—

Would it not be possible to nominate a Vokkaliga member to the Committee of Dharmadarsis?

Second Member of Council.—

Will be considered at the time of the next nominations.

BY MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA (Mandya Taluk).—

Q.—12. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) How many years ago was Venkatasubbaiya, Shanbhogue of Doddarasinkere Village, Malavalli Taluk, appointed as such?

(2) How many times was he suspended and dismissed since then and for what reasons?

(3) Has he given all the village accounts to the taluk records since the date of his appointment?

(4) Is it not a loss to the litigant public if when they apply for the copies of *khates* and *khirdies* for production before civil and criminal courts, they are endorsed that the accounts are not available?

(5) Is it true that he absconded during the *jamabandy* of 1926-27 with the resurvey and other accounts and that a warrant was issued for his arrest?

(6) What is the *jamabandy* of this village? What are the amounts that remained unrecovered at the end of each year since he was appointed Shanbhogue?

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—12. (1) Venkatasubbaiya was appointed Gumasta Shanbhogue of Doddarasinkere Village, Malavalli Taluk, in the year 1908.

(2) In 1923-24, he was ordered by the Deputy Commissioner to be removed from his office as Gumasta owing to his unsatisfactory conduct in a certain case, but on appeal to the Revenue Commissioner, he was reinstated after six months' suspension. He has been kept out of office since last January when he absented himself from *jama-bandi* work.

(3) The accounts of the following years are reported by the Amildar to have been completely received in the taluk records:—

1908-09, 1909-10, 1918-19, 1919-20, 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25 and 1925-26.

(4) No answer required.

(5) The Shanbhogue had gone away from his village during the *jama-bandi* of the hobli in January 1927 and a search warrant had been issued for production of accounts. But subsequently towards the middle of April 1927 he appeared before the Deputy Commissioner with Survey and other accounts urging the plea of some domestic inconvenience for his previous absence.

(6) The *jama-bandi* of the village as per revision survey and settlement is Rs. 11,753-3-4 and a list showing the *salwar* arrears since 1908-09 is given below:—

		Rs.	a.	p.			Rs.	a.	p.
1908-09	..	6,140	13	2	1918-19	..	7,989	12	9
1909-10	..	6,360	4	9	1919-20	..	7,330	12	11
1910-11	..	5,641	10	0	1920-21	..	9,734	0	7
1911-12	..	6,806	13	7	1921-22	..	4,248	5	2
1912-13	..	7,719	8	2	1922-23	..	2,979	6	4
1913-14	..	7,741	1	10	1923-24	..	1,206	13	1
1914-15	..	7,535	10	3	1924-25	..	544	11	1
1915-16	..	6,896	0	0	1925-26	..	1,616	10	4
1916-17	..	5,594	6	4	1926-27	..	4,319	9	10
1917-18	..	5,021	14	2					

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda.—

From the answer to the third part of the question it is clear that accounts for nearly ten years are not available. Is such a position usual?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda.—

The answer to the fourth part is that no answer is required. Is it usual for the village accounts not to be forthcoming like this?

First Member of Council.—

That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda.—

Will it not disable the litigant public from producing the required evidence in civil cases, in the absence of regular village accounts?

Third Member of Council.—

The accounts are not intended for that purpose. It is true that if they are available they can be made use of in the manner referred to, but that they are to be maintained for that purpose cannot be accepted. If village accounts are not available, the party interested will produce some other evidence.

Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda.—

But is it not essential that the accounts should be maintained properly?

Third Member of Council.—

Quite so. But that is a different matter and is engaging the attention of Government.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

With reference to answer to Question 12 (1) that Venkatasubbaiya was appointed Gumasta Shanbhogue, are Government aware that he has been recognized as the *hakdar* Shanbhogue by the Revenue Commissioner?

First Member of Council.—

That question requires notice.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Is it not a fact that the Shanbhogue absented himself from Jamabandi work with previous permission?

Third Member of Council.—

That is a subsidiary matter.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Did he obtain permission or not?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

No information.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Did he at least apply for permission or not?

First Member of Council.—

I want notice.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Was he ill at the time?

(No answer.)

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Has the Government positive information that the ten years' accounts are with the Shanbhogue?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

That is the presumption in the absence of information to the contrary.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Has not a rival candidate for the Shanbhogi presented a petition stating that he has got the accounts with him?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Government have no information on that point.

Another Member.—

Should not Government ascertain the information?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

When accounts were not received for a period, did not Government make enquiries to find out why?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Yes; but these questions are rather inopportune just yet.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Has the Patel had anything to do with the missing of the records?

Third Member of Council.—

The Patel's action is not in question.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—

Does not *salwar baki* include the arrears of previous years?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Yes.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

Was the Shanbhogue in question not suspended more than once?

First Member of Council.—

I want notice.

Dewan.—

The Shanbhogue is an employee of Government and they can deal with him as they like. The question need not therefore be discussed at such length.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

What is the reason for the accumulation of arrears to such a large extent?

Dewan.—

Government cannot answer that question without making enquiries.